	Case 1:22-cv-00761-AWI-CDB Document 18	Filed 10/26/22	Page 1 of 2
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	CARL MEEKS,	Case No. 1:22-cv	-00761-AWI-CDB
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER REQUIRING PARTIES TO FILE JOINT STATUS REPORT BY NOVEMBER	
13	V.		
14	FCA US, LLC, and DOES 1 through 10,	1,2022	
15	Defendants.		
16			
17			
18	On June 22, 2022, Plaintiff Carl Meeks filed an action against Defendants for alleged		
19	violations of the Song-Beverly Act, Cal. Civil Code § 1790 et seq. (ECF No. 1.) On October 26,		
20	2022, the Court convened a scheduling conference at which counsel for Defendant appeared but		
21	counsel for Plaintiff was absent. (ECF No. 15) Accordingly, the Court continued the scheduling		
22	conference, now set for November 2, 2022, at 10:00 a.m.		
23	In his complaint, Plaintiff pleads that venue is proper in the Central District of California		
24	and that assignment to the Eastern Division (presumably, a division of that court) is proper		
25	because "all or most of the events giving rise to Plaintiff's claims, including entering into the		
26	warranty contract for and/or repair of the Subject Vehicle" occurred in San Bernadino County – a		
27	county that is not within the Eastern District of California. (ECF No. 1 at $\P\P$ 2-3). Aside from		
28	Plaintiff's pleading that he is a resident of Kern County, it is not clear what if any nexus this		

Case 1:22-cv-00761-AWI-CDB Document 18 Filed 10/26/22 Page 2 of 2

action has to the Eastern District of California.

Given the deficiencies in Plaintiff's pleading for venue, the Court questions whether the Eastern District of California is the appropriate venue for this action. Transfer of a case to cure improper venue is appropriate when the transfer would be "[f]or the convenience of parties and witnesses," and would also be "in the interest of justice." 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). Courts typically consider numerous private and public factors in weighing whether transfer is warranted.

The Eastern District of California is one of the busiest federal districts in the nation, and its judicial resources are considerably strained. Given the apparent lack of connections to this district and the Court's strained resources, and given that the only venue Plaintiff claims is proper for this case is the Central District of California, the Court preliminarily assesses that transfer is appropriate.

To have the benefit of the parties' views regarding venue, the Court ORDERS the parties to file a joint status report **no later than November 1, 2022**, that explains their positions regarding transfer to the Central District of California.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 Dated: October 26, 2022